United Nations A/70/324

General Assembly

Distr.: General
14 August 2015

Original: English

Seventieth session
Item 74 (a) of the provisional agenda*
Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance: strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations

International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report has been prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 69/243, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to improve the international response to natural disasters and to report thereon to the Assembly at its seventieth session. The report provides an overview of disasters associated with natural hazards that occurred during the reporting period and analyses a number of thematic issues, with a focus on risk management, interoperability, displacement and global policy agendas. The report also provides an overview of progress made in strengthening international cooperation in this regard and concludes with recommendations for further improvements.

* A/70/150.

15-13042 (E) 210915

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The present report has been prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 69/243, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to improve the international response to natural disasters. It covers calendar year 2014.

II. The year in review

A. Disaster data for 2014

2. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) estimates that more than 19.3 million people were displaced by disasters in 2014.[1] Although lower than the average of 26.4 million for each year since 2008, this figure reflects a longer-term upward trend in displacement since the 1970s. For 2014, the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) registered 307 disasters which killed an estimated 7,820 people, affected 107 million people and caused US$ 98 billion in economic damages. Asia and the Pacific was the most affected region, with half (153) of all disasters and 78 per cent of all deaths occurring worldwide. In addition, the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters registered 19 epidemics, including the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, which has so far killed 11,294 people, according to the World Health Organization (WHO).[2] The number of disasters, deaths and people affected remained lower than average in the past 10 years. Similarly, economic losses remained well below the annual average of $147 billion seen in the past 10 years. The floods in Jammu and Kashmir along with Cyclone Hudhud in India were the most economically costly events, at $16 billion and $7 billion respectively. The United Nations Development Group estimates that West Africa may lose an average of at least $3.6 billion per year between 2014 and 2017 owing to the consequences of the Ebola outbreak.

3. Between 1994 and 2013, the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters recorded 6,883 natural disasters worldwide, which claimed 1.35 million lives. A total of 218 million people were affected by disasters on average every year. The frequency of large-scale geophysical disasters remained broadly constant, but a sustained rise in climate-related events (mainly floods and storms) pushed total occurrences significantly higher. Population growth and economic development help explain this upward trend in disaster occurrence. Building in flood plains, earthquake zones and other high-risk areas has increased the likelihood that a natural hazard will become a major catastrophe. The economic impact from disasters over the past 20 years has been staggering, with $2 trillion in recorded losses, and the figure is estimated to reach $3 trillion when the many hidden losses are considered.

B. Overview of disasters associated with natural hazards

4. According to CRED, Asia and the Pacific experienced 153 disasters in 2014, affecting a total of 93 million people, killing 6,060 and, according to IDMC

[1] Excluding displacement related to drought, gradual processes of environmental degradation and biological hazards such as epidemics.

[2] As of 26 July 2015.

estimates, displacing 16.7 million. This represented one third of the casualties in 2013, owing to fewer major hazard events combined with more effective preparedness, early warning systems and evacuation measures. In many countries, such measures consistently helped move people to safety and reduce the number of casualties. During 2014, a total of nine typhoons hit the Philippines. Drawing on lessons learned from Super Typhoon Haiyan in 2013, the Philippines carried out large-scale evacuations of people prior to the landfall of Typhoon Hagupit in December 2014 helped prevent major losses. While Haiyan killed more than 6,300 people in 2013, Hagupit killed 18 people, although it did affect more than 4.1 million people. In India, Cyclone Hudhud made landfall as a category 4 storm in early October with wind speeds of over 190 kilometres per hour. Despite the cyclone's destructive force, early evacuations of about half a million people helped limit the number of deaths to 84.

5. Major floods in India and India-administered Kashmir, which experienced its worst monsoon rains and flash flooding in 50 years, affected almost 23 million people and destroyed millions of acres of crops. Some 2.5 million people were also affected in Pakistan and Pakistan-administered Kashmir. In Sri Lanka, 22 out of the 25 districts and an estimated 1.1 million people were affected by severe floods, while throughout the year, nearly 770,000 people experience food insecurity owing to severe droughts. Landslides in Nepal caused 484 deaths and affected more than 185,000 people. In China, a major drought affected 27.5 million people and an earthquake killed 731 in August, according to CRED.

6. Recurrent drought and floods continued to affect the Sahel region. Some 20 million people, or 1 in 8 inhabitants of that region, entered 2014 food-insecure. Among them, more than 2.5 million required urgent life-saving food assistance. Compared with the 11.3 million people affected by food insecurity in 2013, that figure represented a dramatic increase, driven in particular by the deterioration in the food security situation in parts of Cameroon, Nigeria and Senegal, which together accounted for 40 per cent of the overall caseload. In 2014, 1.5 million children were affected by severe acute malnutrition and an additional 3.4 million by moderate acute malnutrition.

7. In the Greater Horn of Africa, recurrent cycles of drought, floods and conflict across the region stretched the coping capacity of people and left an estimated 20 million people in need of humanitarian assistance. In 2014, over 12.8 million people suffered from acute food insecurity and the overall nutrition situation remains a serious concern. Seasonal flooding continued to affect the region, with an estimated 277,000 people affected in the Sudan alone.

8. In Southern Africa, 117 people were killed and 453,300 affected by floods and storms, including three tropical cyclones. Flood-related emergencies were declared in Zimbabwe and the Comoros, with the latter also hit by a 4.8 magnitude earthquake only weeks before Tropical Cyclone Hellen, adding to significant infrastructure damage and displacing 3,000 people on the island of Anjouan. In Madagascar, a locust infestation ongoing since 2012 continued to threaten the livelihoods of 13 million people, or 60 per cent of the population.

9. In Latin America and the Caribbean, 4.5 million people, including 1.2 million people in Colombia alone, were affected by disasters. Seasonal flooding in Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Paraguay left 575,000 people in need of humanitarian assistance. In Central America, 4 million people were affected by food insecurity or

loss of livelihoods resulting from a drought compounded by a fungal outbreak affecting the primary coffee crop.

C. Epidemics

10. In 2014-2015, the Ebola outbreak had a profound impact on three high-transmission countries, namely, Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone, and also affected Mali and Nigeria, killing an estimated 11,294 people. Health systems were stretched to their limits, while vaccinations and general health services were brought to a halt for months, thereby increasing deaths from other health conditions and impeding the functioning of routine maternal health and other health services. The closure of schools left more than 5 million children without education for months. By March 2015, the outbreak had also left more than 16,000 orphaned, killed breadwinners, caregivers and health personnel, and threatened livelihoods. Survivors have been left traumatized both physically and psychologically, with many unable to return home owing to stigma. Malnutrition and food insecurity, already prevalent before the outbreak, are expected to increase through 2015. Protection-related concerns included the displacement of entire villages, driven by fear of the disease, and by security measures at border posts and around quarantined areas. National Governments and local actors quickly mobilized and scaled up a joint response with support from international actors. National private sector actors were among the first to sensitize the population and deploy their capabilities, know-how and understanding of the local context. The United Nations Mission for Ebola Emergency Response (UNMEER) was established as a temporary measure to lead the response. Over 175 organizations were involved in emergency response programmes in the three high-transmission countries to stop the outbreak, raise awareness and engage with the communities, treat the infected, ensure the provision of essential services, preserve stability and prevent the outbreak from spreading to unaffected countries. Key lessons underscored the centrality of local capacities and communities in the design and implementation of the response and in mitigating the impact of the outbreak in order to build long-term sustainability and resilience. The outbreak also highlighted the need for stronger collaboration between the health and humanitarian communities.

D. Funding trends related to natural disasters

11. Global humanitarian funding reported to the Financial Tracking Service reached $22.4 billion in 2014. Of this, $3.5 billion (16 per cent) was reported for emergencies classified as disasters — an amount over eight times greater than the $407 million received in 2012 and over one third greater than the amount received in 2013. Of that $3.5 billion in funding for disasters in 2014, 74 per cent ($2.6 billion) was in response to the Ebola outbreak and 24 per cent ($844 million) in response to Typhoon Haiyan.[3]

12. The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) disbursed $460.8 million in 2014, of which $45.2 million was for response to disasters. This represented the lowest level of annual CERF funding for natural disaster responses since the Fund's inception in 2006. Allocations included $25.7 million for response to drought,

[3] As of 10 April 2015 and including contributions with a decision date in 2014.

$15.8 million for floods, $2.5 million for a coffee rust plague and $500,000 for a locust infestation. The five countries receiving the largest amounts were Ethiopia ($5.8 million), Guatemala ($5.4 million), Senegal ($4.5 million), Burkina Faso ($3.9 million) and Bolivia (Plurinational State of) ($3.2 million). The Fund helped humanitarian organizations fight the Ebola outbreak in West Africa. With $15.2 million from CERF, agencies were able to quickly scale up their emergency response, which included treatment and prevention programmes in Guinea ($7.3 million), Sierra Leone ($6.1 million), Liberia ($1.9 million) and Nigeria ($1.5 million).

III. Managing risk

A. Urgency of the issue

13. Notwithstanding the reduced number of disasters in 2014, drivers of risk, such as climate change, food and nutrition insecurity, water scarcity, demographic shifts, rapid urbanization, intensifying conflicts, complexity of crises, recurrent and protracted displacement and irregular migration, are expected to increase exposure and vulnerability to natural hazards in the future. In many complex emergencies and protracted crises, disasters are one of the sources of increasing needs and complexity. Despite the increase in available resources, humanitarian needs have outstripped response capacity. Taking action now to build better risk-informed and needs-driven strategies for humanitarian and development action is imperative and constitutes a key element in the tackling of current and future challenges. The World Humanitarian Summit, to be held in Istanbul in May 2016, will offer the members of the global community a major opportunity to come together to strengthen humanitarian action and put affected people at its centre.

B. Need for a new risk-informed and needs-driven business model for joint humanitarian and development action

14. Faced by large and increasing global humanitarian demand and complexity of needs, better alignment of development and humanitarian action is needed to support strengthening of resilience and lasting integrated solutions. Multiple initiatives have improved coherence and coordination of humanitarian and development action to manage risks and build resilience, but further improvements are needed to strengthen collective action, including in aligning delivery based on common analysis, goals and programmes for effective implementation.

15. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, adopted by the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, held in Sendai City, Japan, from 14 to 18 March 2015,[4] provides a new holistic framework for disaster risk management for stakeholders at all levels. The Framework includes, inter alia, a set of guiding principles, seven global targets and four priorities for action[5] at the local,

[4] Endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 69/283 of 3 June 2015 and contained in annex II thereto.

[5] Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk; Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk; Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience; and Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to "Build Back Better" in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction.

national, regional and global levels. The Framework, which recognizes that managing disaster risk is an important component of sustainable development and includes multiple actions and entry points for humanitarian actors, aims at strengthening the capacities of communities and countries to reduce risk. Through its focus on preparedness, response and recovery, countries will acquire greater capacity to respond and to provide a more effective partner platform for coordination with the international humanitarian system. This presents an opportunity for closer joint humanitarian and development action in managing disaster risks, implementing the Framework and mobilizing stakeholders.

16. Collective leadership is required to put into action the commitment to joint initiatives, provide incentives to strengthen resilience before, during and after crises, and ensure that partners are working towards common goals. The needs of vulnerable and affected people and local capacities should give form to the central organizing principle and the core of joint humanitarian and development action.

17. There must be increased emphasis on and investment in developing common and holistic understanding of context and risks, as this is critical to delivering coherent and complementary humanitarian and development action., which in turn requires greater anticipation of emerging risks, future needs and investment in capacities. Understanding the dynamics of risks and translating that understanding into multi-year planning so as to build capacities will help in tackling the underlying factors exacerbating humanitarian risks.

18. Common risk analysis must provide the necessary evidence base for both short-term planning (1-3 years) and long-term planning (3-10 years). To capitalize on the opportunities emerging from managing risks, actors should agree on initial shared risk analysis, even if different actors will conduct different activities according to their own comparative advantages. Given the cascading impact that unmanaged risk can have in terms of increasing other risks and creating compounding effects, it is important that risk be managed jointly and that different activities to manage risks and build resilience be undertaken simultaneously, instead of on the basis of a linear approach entailing the transition from relief to development.

19. Risk analysis and subsequent activities to manage identified risks must incorporate gender, age and disability perspectives in order to be effective and strengthen the resilience of communities and reduce vulnerabilities. Inclusive participation and contribution should be guaranteed when risk management policies and humanitarian response are being designed and implemented. Utilization of data disaggregated by sex and age together with gender and diversity analysis to inform all assessment and planning processes is vital to enhancing the transformative impact of risk management on the lives and resilience of the most vulnerable. They must also incorporate disability perspectives.

20. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), particularly through its Task Team on Preparedness and Resilience, has developed tools that harness and support a common understanding of risk. These include the Index for Risk Management (INFORM), the revamped IASC Early Warning, the Emergency Response Preparedness (ERP) approach and the Common Framework for Preparedness developed by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee together with the United Nations Development Group and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction.

21. The Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Emergency Relief Coordinator have encouraged resident coordinators/humanitarian coordinators to use INFORM during the process of formulating strategic response plans, common country assessments and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks to support joint analysis and understanding of risks and to contribute to the development of common strategies and priorities for addressing those risks. INFORM results can serve to influence national policies and resource allocation by helping to identify risks, build resilience and facilitate better preparation for crises. The next phase of INFORM will provide regional and national risk models using the current global methodology. These will be adapted to local risks and scale.

22. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee ERP approach, an inter-agency initiative for building preparedness capacity at country level, aims towards systematically identifying and monitoring risks and improving risk analysis, as part of comprehensive preparedness actions. Since its launch in December 2014, the ERP approach has already been used in more than 10 countries, including Burundi, Haiti, Iraq, Myanmar and Ukraine. IASC Early Warning is being developed as a subset of the ERP approach to better support risk-informed decision-making, in particular through better understanding of the "return on investment" of various options for targeted preparedness funding. This analysis is one of the basic enabling steps for coherent support to national preparedness capacity development through the Common Framework for Preparedness.

C. Coherent humanitarian and development action in managing disaster risk

23. While the international humanitarian system spends significant resources in response to crises, greater political and financial investments in preparedness and prevention of disasters from the outset are needed. Success in integrating risk will be measured by reduced exposure and vulnerability to natural hazards and on the basis of whether disasters have been averted or mitigated. This requires investment in risk-informed sustainable development. Concerted and coordinated humanitarian and development action in risk management, including in preparedness for responding, recovery and livelihoods support, is an important contribution to these efforts.

24. Humanitarian action and development action need to be coherent, mutually reinforcing and contiguous. They should be underpinned by a common understanding of shared longer-term outcomes that ensure effective risk management. The international humanitarian community needs to take a risk-informed outcome-driven approach, involving clear objectives within a time frame and an exit strategy which reinforces national capacities and resilience. Increasingly, international humanitarian action is substituting for development and government action, particularly in protracted and recurring crises. Humanitarian and development action requires close communication and coordination of programming, and determination of roles and responsibilities based on an assessment of technical competencies and capacity to deliver, enabling decisions on when different actions should be taken and by whom. It also requires support for national actors within and across all sectors, ensuring the right balance and complementarity of activities.

25. International humanitarian organizations need to complement and reinforce local capacities, actors, outcomes and ownership of disaster response. The multilateral system should support the primary responsibility of Governments for addressing disasters. The work of international actors should be aligned with government planning and processes, building their ownership of response.

D. Progress in incorporating risk management in humanitarian action and joint activities with development actors

26. Humanitarian and development actors should systematically replicate best practices in resilience and risk management activities and go to scale. Leadership should encourage and incentivize innovation to enable development of new tools and approaches for delivering integrated support to vulnerable people, communities and countries, while financing should incentivize increased efficiency and effectiveness through predictability, reliability and results-based approaches. Rigorous evaluation and monitoring of transformative impacts should be undertaken to identify success stories and build an evidence base. A number of recent major initiatives show promise and valuable lessons in this regard. The World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016, the 2030 agenda for sustainable development and the Sendai Framework offer key opportunities to build on and systematize longer-term thinking and action which responds to current needs and builds local capacities to cope with future risks and crises.

27. A significant initiative which is coming to fruition is the joint Inter-Agency Standing Committee-United Nations Development Group Guiding Principles on Resilience. The Principles are broadly: (a) to prioritize context and support to local and national ownership; (b) to account for and address underlying risks; (c) to adopt comprehensive, flexible, integrated and area-based programming; (d) to seek strategic partnerships and multi-stakeholder cooperation; and (e) to advocate for and ensure predictable and flexible financing. The Principles are anchored in core humanitarian and development principles and reinforce existing principles and agreements, including the United Nations Plan of Action on Disaster Risk Reduction for Resilience and the Sendai Framework.

28. The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI), an inter-agency partnership, encompasses a coherent system-wide effort to support Governments in developing their capacities to prevent, manage and recover from disasters. Based on the technical expertise of its 12 member agencies, CADRI assisted 20 countries in assessing their capacity needs and gaps, and developing action plans for disaster risk reduction, including preparedness for response. The CADRI tool for capacity assessment and planning is structured according to the four priority areas of the Sendai Framework, one of which is specifically focused on preparedness for disaster response, recovery and reconstruction. The CADRI partnership, which has integrated a risk management approach into its country selection, including through use of INFORM, could be more widely used in high-risk countries to address capacity gaps in response and recovery.

29. States have a central role to play in promoting a stronger link between humanitarian and development approaches in their domestic governance systems for disaster risk management. Recent research carried out by UNDP and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies has shown that

while much national law- and policymaking accompanied the roll-out of the Hyogo Framework for Action: 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disaster,[6] significant gaps still remain in the content and implementation of domestic legislation in many countries, in particular regarding the sectoral laws that are most closely related to the underlying drivers of risk, such as laws on land use and construction. Affected States can enhance the effectiveness and complementarity of incoming international relief efforts by adopting new laws and rules drawing on the Guidelines for the Domestic Facilitation and Regulation of International Disaster Relief and Initial Recovery Assistance. To date, some 18 countries have done so, but many others still lack clear and consistent rules for managing incoming relief.

E. Funding across the spectrum of risk management

30. Between 2004 and 2014, owing to the increase in the severity and frequency of crises, annual inter-agency humanitarian appeals grow by 600 per cent, from $3 billion to $18 billion. At the same time, the number of people being targeted for assistance through inter-agency appeals more than doubled, to 76 million. While donors have provided more resources for humanitarian work, nearly doubling their contributions from $5.6 billion in 2011 to $10.4 billion in 2014, the gap between what is requested and what is received has grown in both absolute and percentage terms, from 37 per cent ($3.3 billion) in 2011 to 40 per cent ($6.9 billion) in 2014. The widening of this gap calls into question the ability of the international humanitarian community to continue to meet the needs of affected people.

31. International humanitarian actors are asked to do more under more dangerous circumstances, especially at a time where crises are lasting longer than ever before. Protracted and chronic crises have become the new normal. Responding to such crises exhausts international resources that could be used to address root causes of vulnerability and build resilience and thereby enhance the capacity of countries and communities to cope with shocks. The situation is further exacerbated by shortcomings as regards effectively financing a long-term transition which focuses on tackling risk and vulnerability while reducing the need for humanitarian assistance. These situations call for a closer examination of the nexus between humanitarian and development action and financing.

32. More dynamic planning is needed — planning that includes resource mobilization over a multi-year framework and prioritizes funding for risk reduction,. While humanitarian funding focuses on immediate response, a longer-term strategic approach to addressing underlying risks and persisting vulnerability would require increased development funding for risk reduction. The most recent data on global financing for disaster risk reduction has highlighted that the total amounted to just $13.5 billion over a 20-year period, a fraction of the more than $3 trillion spent on overall development aid over the same period. Innovative solutions are needed to support a timely and predictable response and enable systematic planning and budgeting. Comprehensive financial protections strategies, including risk financing and insurance, and innovations such as automatic triggers, should be considered in order to minimize costs and delays during disaster response.

[6] A/CONF.206/6 and Corr.1, chap. I, resolution 2.

33. Assistance for preventing crises rarely goes to the countries that are most at risk of experiencing a humanitarian crisis. For example, the Central African Republic was ranked the third most at-risk country by INFORM in 2014, yet it was ranked seventy-eighth as a recipient of official development assistance (ODA). Financing for disaster risk reduction is heavily concentrated in relatively few, mostly middle-income countries and remains at negligible levels for high-risk countries, as compared with financing for response. Current funding mechanisms therefore need to include an objective and shared assessment of crisis risk. Such assessments and subsequent contingency planning for natural hazards, using forecasting models such as INFORM and seasonal weather projections, can help anticipate, and provide more reliable indications of, the frequency and number of possible disasters. This can inform financial preparedness and the design of mechanisms and measures, such as funding reserves and other forms of ex ante financial planning, to meet anticipated demand for financing at times of peak need. This should include triggers for the early release of funding for early action, for instance, in advance of a tropical storm making landfall or in the event of failed seasonal rains and early signs of drought. In addition, insurance and other risk financing tools offer opportunities to better finance crisis prevention and share risks.

34. Humanitarian financing, recovery financing and development financing need to be complementary. Emerging climate and sustainable development financing should incrementally cover protracted, predictable and recurrent events by reducing vulnerability, while humanitarian and recovery financing should focus on strengthening capacity and readiness for a timely quality response to major events. This also requires a commitment to provide resources for gender-based humanitarian action. Financing must increasingly focus on transitioning out of crises and preventing their recurrence. The focus should be on helping countries, communities and national civil society manage risks by themselves. This would enable regional and international humanitarian actors to gradually focus more on the most severe crises. In disaster-prone contexts, clearer protocols and arrangements involving the government, development actors and humanitarian organizations need to be in place in order to indicate when and under which conditions the international humanitarian system may need to engage.

35. Finding innovative and efficient ways to finance humanitarian work is a key pillar of necessary change. The Secretary-General has therefore launched a High-level Panel on Humanitarian Financing to provide recommendations which will also feed into the World Humanitarian Summit. The Panel aims at providing political support by issuing high-level recommendations on how to better understand the drivers of humanitarian cost, determine what needs to change to enable a more nimble and flexible humanitarian financing architecture, identify additional funding sources, better leverage partnerships and increase efficiencies. The Panel is undertaking its work with the support of a secretariat provided by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat.

IV. Strengthening interoperability

36. The context for disaster response and the role of international responders vis-à-vis national Governments, communities and other actors are changing. National Governments and actors are increasingly at the centre of response in

disaster settings, while the role of international actors will progressively focus on augmenting national capacities.

37. As capacity and expertise in respect of mitigating the impact of disasters continue to grow at the national and local levels, more Governments are able to manage disasters without international humanitarian assistance. The tripling of the global economy from $25 trillion to $75 trillion over the past 20 years and the emergence of middle-income countries have enabled many Governments that had been aid recipients to leverage their economic growth for investments in disaster preparedness and response capacity. They are meeting needs using their own response capacities, including national disaster management agencies, domestic militaries, civil society and the private sector. While Asia continues to be the region most affected by disasters, fewer countries in the region, including those with the largest numbers of people affected, have requested international assistance in the past few years. The investment that some countries make in national disaster management at home outweighs by far what they receive in external assistance. For example, estimates indicate that between 2009 and 2012, the Philippines invested $2.3 billion in domestic humanitarian response, far more than it received in international humanitarian assistance during that period. These developments are leading to a shift towards more regional and bilateral investments in humanitarian assistance, which opens up new opportunities and additional capacity for preparedness, response and recovery.

38. Communities prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters differently today, owing partly to opportunities arising from the availability of new technologies and the growing involvement of the private sector. Given the increase in urban emergencies, local actors are leading efforts to build sustainable systems, including for early warning, and accelerate recovery, while leveraging the human and financial resources available in most cities. Other actors, including civil society, diaspora communities, regional actors, foreign militaries, the private sector and donors, constitute response and delivery systems in their own right.

39. These trends highlight a major opportunity to mitigate the impact of disasters globally by (a) more systematically and predictably connecting different response and recovery capacities during the preparedness phase and (b) building upon capacities at the national and local levels rather than substituting them through the import of external goods, services, programming and coordination. This requires investment in the policy, capacity development and operational coordination mechanisms required to support the connectivity and complementarity of all of the different actors, systems and networks centred around needs and expected outcomes, and predictability of capacities and resources, within an agreed response framework, in order to enable optimization of collective response to growing needs.

40. In this context, the term *interoperability* can be understood as describing the effort to enable systems that are by nature very different to work better together and in a predictable way, based on their comparative advantages, without co-opting and while accommodating different values. Some countries are already reconciling numerous actors and systems through a modular approach, where different groups of responders have pre-established roles which can be adopted in an emergency and are managed by a government agency at central level. This requires building a common understanding of their key operating standards and approaches, mapping response and recovery capacity and gaps within and across all sectors in a country,

and identifying opportunities to increase cooperation and complementarity among different responders.

41. Preparedness is central to improved interoperability and effective augmentation of national capacities. Interoperability should become a common feature and objective of joint preparedness planning and engagement with national and local governments. It is a function of effective preparedness, response and recovery planning, and cannot be achieved spontaneously. For example, in the Asia-Pacific region, a shift is already taking place towards coordinating with a wider group of actors and systems in the context of preparedness for sudden-onset disasters. Past experience and dialogue with national and local authorities indicate that key immediate needs and the most commonly requested assistance items following disasters can often be anticipated in advance. This can serve as a basis for predetermining which responders in the region, ranging from humanitarian organizations and Governments to the private sector and militaries, can contribute which services during disasters, and what is required in terms of stockpiling, local procurement, standby arrangements, pre-signed agreements, and identification of suppliers and transportation routes. Gaps that cannot be addressed at the country level should be taken up at the regional level by humanitarian and regional organizations and coordination bodies, and national capabilities, including militaries, where appropriate. If gaps cannot be addressed at the regional level, the process should be repeated at the global level in line with the IASC Emergency Response Preparedness approach mentioned above and in coordination with Member States and regional organizations.

42. Humanitarian civil-military coordination can provide best practices and unique capacities for facilitating interoperability. Member State armed forces are routinely deployed to provide essential life-saving support to national and local disaster response operations. Adherence to the principles of the Oslo Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief remains fundamental for a needs-driven Member State response, with commitment to predictable, coherent and proper use of foreign military assets. The introduction of universal standards for the utilization of foreign military assets would facilitate decision-making by Member States that are considering engaging their militaries in support of disaster response. These standards constitute concrete measures that can be taken by Governments at a strategic, operational and tactical level to ensure accountability to people in need. They can assist decision-making with rapid assessment of potential gaps that could be filled by foreign military assets based on the likelihood and scale of need.

43. There will be a rapid evolution in the role of the multilateral system in disaster contexts, from implementer of assistance to broker of solutions, repository of good practice and provider of technical advice and niche capabilities. However, despite progress made in building national response capacity, many Governments will initially be overwhelmed by major sudden-onset emergencies, particularly in high-risk countries. No level of development will completely eliminate this vulnerability. Governments will also continue to benefit from specific technical support, building on best practices and international standards. Effective external assistance can increase the speed and volume of assistance, and ensure that international standards and principles are more closely followed. Regional and international assistance and networks will therefore continue to play an important role by augmenting and complementing national efforts in the immediate aftermath of major disasters.

V. Displacement

44. According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, historical models suggest that even after adjusting for population growth, the likelihood of displacement by a disaster today is 60 per cent higher than in the 1970s. The primary drivers of this increase have been rapid unplanned urbanization, population growth and economic development in hazard-prone areas. Climate change may further increase displacement risk in the future by increasing the frequency and intensity of some weather-related hazards and the vulnerability of communities.

45. Major disasters over the past few years point to the need for closer collaboration between humanitarian and development actors in preventing and addressing displacement, and planning for recovery and solutions as soon as possible after disasters. Displacement should not be approached as a purely humanitarian issue: solutions rooted in development and political actions are required. Development actors need to increase their engagement from the onset of disasters so as to ensure that the development dimensions of displacement are addressed before displacement becomes protracted. Development action can also play a role in preventing displacement from taking place, for example, through investment in, inter alia, safer housing and building codes, and climate change adaptation strategies which enhance the resilience of households, including by facilitating voluntary migration with dignity and planning for the relocation of at-risk communities in a participatory and rights-based manner. Development action should play a central role in ensuring durable solutions to protracted displacement and in building the capacity of national institutions to address displacement.

46. Although disaster-induced displacement is usually of shorter duration than that caused by conflict, it often has long-lasting repercussions and can become protracted. The latest IDMC analysis highlights the plight of people who have been living in conditions of protracted displacement following disasters for up to 26 years. In Haiti, large-scale humanitarian programmes were rolled out to respond to the needs arising from the 2010 earthquake, which displaced over 1.5 million people and caused extensive destruction of infrastructure and housing. While the majority of the people displaced by the earthquake found accommodation outside camps, some 80,000 vulnerable people still remain in them. The recently launched Haiti transitional appeal serves as the key strategic and programmatic guidance for humanitarian, transition and resilience-building actions in support of the Government in addressing the needs of the most vulnerable.

47. Displacement is not just an outcome of disasters but also a driver of future disaster risks, as it exacerbates pre-existing vulnerabilities. Risks are particularly acute in urban areas, where shelters for displaced persons are generally not included in land management plans or built in accordance with housing codes. Consequently, displaced persons are often at risk of inclusion in secondary and repeated cycles of displacement. For example, in Haiti, an estimated 3.5 million people, many of them current or former displaced persons or internal economic migrants, live in informal settlements and remain highly vulnerable to natural hazards and to their impact.

48. To increase the predictability of response, functioning national institutions, coordination systems, and legal and political frameworks on displacement must be in place prior to disasters. A good example in this regard was provided by the Government of the Philippines in the management of Typhoon Hagupit in December

2014. Based on the lessons learned from previous disasters, the Government activated coordination structures, opened information hotlines, established evacuation centres, mobilized resources and pre-positioned relief items ahead of the Typhoon's landfall. As a result, the number of affected people and casualties was minimized, while those displaced received timely assistance and protection.

49. Legal and political frameworks should cover all forms of displacement and all of its phases, from prevention to response and support through to solutions. At the global level, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2, annex) are the primary tool for guiding the action of Governments and humanitarian and development partners in assisting and protecting internally displaced persons. Regional organizations can also play an important role in making the response to displacement more predictable. The African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa provides for the establishment of national and regional mechanisms for early warning, disaster risk reduction and the coordination of humanitarian assistance. The Convention requires States to work towards the creation of conditions capable of facilitating return, local integration or relocation in a manner that is sustainable and that respects the dignity and safety of internally displaced persons. Other regions should consider adopting similar standards.

50. Relevant solutions to displacement, based on the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons, should receive enhanced support. In the aftermath of disasters, the return of displaced persons may be hampered by lingering or new disaster risks, and often no assistance is offered either to those wishing to integrate locally or to host communities. When there is an offer of relocation, it is important for the process to be transparent, with clear guidelines and necessary resources. The basic principles and guidelines on development-based evictions and displacement (A/HRC/4/18, annex I) offer additional guidance which can be applied in situations of disasters.

51. The Sendai Framework includes multiple actions that should be incorporated in regional and national strategies to enable a better use of disaster risk reduction to prevent and mitigate displacement. It calls for the integration of post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction into the economic and social sustainable development of affected areas, including temporary settlements where displaced persons live. The Framework underlines the need to prepare for ensuring a rapid and effective response to disasters and related displacement, encompassing, inter alia, provision of access to safe shelter, essential food and non-food relief supplies and basic health-care services, including sexual and reproductive health. It encourages States to adopt policies and programmes addressing disaster-induced human mobility to strengthen the resilience of affected people and host communities. It also calls for transboundary cooperation in addressing displacement risk in areas with common ecosystems, such as river basins and coastlines. In countries with high risk of disaster-induced displacement, sustainable long-term solutions, including investments in urban planning, permanent housing and access to basic services, such as health care, and livelihoods, are essential.

52. At its sixteenth session, held in Cancun, Mexico, from 29 November to 10 December 2010, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change decided to establish the Cancun Adaptation

Framework,[7] with the objective of enhancing action on adaptation to climate change. Recognizing the implications of climate change, inter alia, for displacement, the Conference of the Parties invited all Parties to undertake voluntary measures to enhance understanding, coordination and cooperation with regard to climate change-induced displacement, migration and planned relocation (decision 1/CP.16, para. 14 (f)). At its nineteenth session, held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention established the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage,[8] under the Cancun Adaptation Framework, which also identifies displacement as a potential consequence of climate change. Integrated climate and disaster risk management strategies and plans can help build resilience so as to assist people in avoiding displacement; and can also, where appropriate, facilitate human mobility, which would entail plans for, inter alia, evacuation, voluntary migration and planned relocation, as a means of adapting to the negative impacts of climate change, disasters and environmental degradation. Planned relocation can help achieve durable solutions by enabling displaced persons to rebuild their lives and livelihoods elsewhere.

53. The Nansen Initiative on cross-border displacement in the context of disasters and the effects of climate change, led by Norway and Switzerland, has concluded a series of intergovernmental regional meetings in the Pacific, Central America, the Greater Horn of Africa, South-East Asia and South Asia. Discussions with civil society organizations and experts were also organized. The Initiative has successfully contributed to framing the needs and challenges associated with cross-border displacement. Additional efforts are required to put in place a comprehensive response to such displacement, including key legal, institutional, operational and financial factors. In October 2015, Member States will convene in Geneva to discuss a protection agenda, including recommendations for future action for cross-border displacement and other forms of human mobility in the context of disasters. As the Initiative will conclude at the end of 2015, it will be important to establish an international institutional arrangement on this issue to ensure effective implementation of successful practices addressing disaster-induced displacement, which can be used by States and other actors in the areas of humanitarian action, human rights protection, migration management, refugee protection, disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and development.

VI. Global policy agendas: implications and opportunities for humanitarian action in the post-2015 era

54. Global policy agendas, such as the post-2015 development agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (General Assembly resolution 69/313, annex), the Sendai Framework, the new climate change agreement, the New Urban Agenda and the World Humanitarian Summit present or will present unique opportunities to better address global challenges common to development and humanitarian action. The agendas can also help generate the transformative shift discussed in this report, especially in the context of the World Humanitarian Summit.

[7] See FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1, decision 1/CP.16, sect. II.

[8] See FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.1, decision 2/CP.19.

55. Member States will adopt the post-2015 development agenda entitled "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" encompassing the new, visionary framework for eradicating poverty and ensuring sustainable development which promises to leave no one behind. The agenda must prioritize inclusive sustainable development strategies designed to benefit the most vulnerable people and countries. To deliver on this ambition, humanitarian action and development action need to be better aligned and coordinated. Chronic and protracted crises and disasters should be addressed with a longer-term perspective, one that builds on the contribution and comparative advantages of both communities.

56. Humanitarian and development programming and financing in the post-2015 era must be designed with the aim of progressively reducing vulnerability and the risk of shocks and development setbacks over multi-year planning cycles, reflecting recognition of the fact that achieving sustainable development will be impossible without ensuring that nations and communities are resilient to shocks. There is a need for a greater focus on strengthening national and local capacity to anticipate, manage, respond to and recover from disasters, crises and other shocks and on improving coordination of response and prevention work with sustainable development.

57. Implementing and achieving the 2030 agenda for sustainable development will require a shift in strategic plans, programming and financing. All actors must work together to support the effort to put vulnerable people on a sustainable path, including a reduction of humanitarian needs. For this to happen, all stakeholders will need to overcome political, institutional and structural impediments to their working better together and reposition themselves, with risk management and the needs and aspirations of the most vulnerable at the core of their action.

58. For the international community, the ability to reach some of the targets under the 2030 agenda for sustainable development and ensure the fulfilment of its central promise to leave no one behind will require an increased focus on the most vulnerable people within fragile States, protracted crises and disaster-prone countries. While humanitarian assistance plays an important role in saving lives, it has limited ability to move beyond that role. If Governments and development partners do not step in, then many of the most vulnerable people will be trapped in a situation where they are provided with annual handouts to ensure basic survival, while often also remaining in a situation of protracted displacement. Development action needs to provide longer-term assistance to the most vulnerable in order to help build their resilience and allow them to benefit from and contribute to sustainable development.

59. The shaping of financial flows in ways that reduce risk and build resilience instead of creating new risk will constitute a vital figure in the landscape of financing for the achievement of sustainable development. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda articulates a strong message, namely, that current policy, financing and investment patterns do not adequately consider the shocks and risks characteristic of our interconnected world. This message needs to incorporated in the whole post-2015 agenda and its implementation. The commitment involved requires dedicated coherent financing for risk management and resilience of all kinds, including risk-informed sustainable development and sustainable national capacity.

60. An ambitious global climate agreement, to be agreed by Member States at the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to be held in Paris from 30 November to 11 December 2015, will be vital to addressing the humanitarian implications of climate change. Climate change poses a major threat, already affecting millions of people every year. It will exacerbate the vulnerability of the poorest and place the humanitarian system and Governments under significant pressure to cope with growing needs. The new agreement should target adaptation measures towards the most vulnerable countries and communities and provide adequate adaptation funding, which is additional to existing humanitarian and development financing, to urgently strengthen resilience and disaster risk management as critical components of adaptation and the better integration of climate risks into humanitarian and development action.

61. The New Urban Agenda, to emerge from the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III), should include recommendations on how to build urban resilience through risk-informed urban development and better alignment of humanitarian and development programming and financing. Action in urban areas needs to recognize the complexity of cities, with improved urban expertise and capacities within organizations, while building on the capabilities, opportunities and potential new partnerships present in urban settings.

62. These agendas offer an opportunity to align and coherently address priorities shared by the humanitarian and development communities. The Sendai Framework and its implementation will help strengthen the critical link between disasters and risk of displacement, especially preparedness for effective response to disasters and related displacement. The new climate change agreement can help advance efforts to ensure adequate protection of those displaced across borders in the context of disasters and the effects of climate change, and to address related gaps in legal frameworks. The New Urban Agenda will also present an opportunity to enhance response to urban displacement.

63. The World Humanitarian Summit, along with these global frameworks, must lead to transformative impacts on the lives of the most vulnerable and marginalized people living in protracted crises, and disaster-prone and fragile countries, which will serve as a measure of their success. The Summit provides a significant opportunity to strengthen and reinvigorate support and action for humanitarianism, including by reinforcing normative frameworks, and galvanizing further action to manage risks more effectively in a principled manner so as to save lives, prevent and alleviate suffering and uphold human dignity in the face of humanitarian crises.

VII. Recommendations

64. On the basis of the above discussions, the Secretary-General makes the following recommendations:

(a) Member States, the United Nations, humanitarian and development organizations and all relevant stakeholders should adapt to and address, as an integral element of sustainable development, the changing scope, scale and complexity of humanitarian crises, including disasters, and their adverse impact on

sustainable development, in line with the post-2015 development agenda and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction;

(b) Member States and the United Nations should focus humanitarian, recovery and development programming and financing so as to progressively reduce vulnerability and manage the risk of disasters and development setbacks over multi-year planning cycles, including through integrating risk management into national sustainable development plans and ensuring the connectivity of humanitarian plans with longer-term sustainable development priorities;

(c) Member States, the United Nations and humanitarian and development organizations should strengthen data collection and data sharing, including through a common framework, so that they can inform policy and measures designed to address disaster risks and their consequences and monitor the situation of vulnerable people, including displaced persons;

(d) Member States and the United Nations should enhance the use of common risk analysis, including the use of the Index for Risk Management (INFORM), to establish the evidence base for short-, medium- and long-term planning and joint strategies for disaster and climate risk management, capacity development and resilience-building, allowing for greater prioritization of resources where the risk is greatest;

(e) Humanitarian and development organizations should systematically replicate best practices in resilience and risk management, and continue to scale up tools and support for assessing and addressing capacity gaps in disaster risk management, including response and recovery, in countries at risk of disasters and among vulnerable people and civil society, including through longer-term, predictable institutional funding;

(f) Member States should adopt and implement national laws and regulations to reduce the impact of the underlying drivers of disaster risk and vulnerability, and also adopt comprehensive rules and procedures for the facilitation and regulation of international disaster assistance, drawing, as appropriate, on the Guidelines for the Domestic Facilitation and Regulation of International Disaster Relief and Initial Recovery Assistance, and calling on the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, relevant United Nations organizations and other partners for technical support in achieving these aims;

(g) The United Nations, Member States and humanitarian and development organizations should further investigate how to facilitate interoperability among key actors in disaster settings. In this regard, Member States, the United Nations and humanitarian organizations should invest in strengthening local and national disaster response capacities and leadership in order to complement national capacities to respond to and recover from disasters, especially in locations of high disaster risk and recurring disasters, including by identifying comparative advantages and capacities at the regional and global levels that can help fill gaps in national capacity and delivery of humanitarian assistance;

(h) Member States and regional organizations should work together to strengthen regional cooperation towards strengthening national and regional capacity to better understand risks and prepare for and respond to disasters in support of national efforts, including through enhancing interoperability at the

regional level and by exchanging experiences in using different models in other regions;

(i) Member States, supported by the United Nations, should develop national laws and policies on internal displacement which address disaster-induced displacement, detail responsibilities and measures to minimize the impact of disasters, protect and assist internally displaced persons following disasters, and ensure durable solutions. In this respect, Member States should adopt standards in line with the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons and the Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-based Evictions and Displacement;

(j) Member States, the United Nations and humanitarian and development organizations should integrate building of resilience and human mobility into relevant strategies, plans and legal frameworks, in particular regarding disaster risk management and climate change adaptation, as integral elements of sustainable development at the national and regional levels so as to help prevent and mitigate displacement in the context of disasters and the effects of climate change, including in urban settings where displaced persons have particular needs, requirements and vulnerabilities;

(k) Member States, humanitarian and development organizations and other stakeholders should integrate and implement a holistic disaster risk management approach at all levels in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, including strengthened capacity of local actors, and better coherence of financing for humanitarian, recovery and development action;

(l) Member States should coordinate with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs early on in a disaster response so as to ensure predictable, coherent and needs-based deployment of foreign military assets and personnel supporting humanitarian assistance, in adherence to the principles of the Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief;

(m) Member States, the United Nations and humanitarian and development organizations should ensure a comprehensive, coherent, systematic and people-centred approach to managing risks, including through the new global frameworks for disaster risk reduction, sustainable development and climate change and the New Urban Agenda, and through the outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit;

(n) Member States should achieve an ambitious global climate agreement with a long-term vision so as to take urgent, effective and comprehensive action towards reducing global greenhouse gas emissions, limiting global temperature rise to less than 2 degrees Celsius from pre-industrial levels, and strengthening resilience, particularly among those most vulnerable to the adverse impact of climate change.